



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2025

by B Astley-Serougi BA(Hons) LLM MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/W/25/3367248

73 High Street, Kidlington, Oxfordshire OX5 2DN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Rajinder Parshad against the decision of Cherwell District Council.
- The application Ref is 24/03350/F.
- The development proposed is described as first floor extension over an existing garage with eaves height increment to accommodate new windows.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form states that the development was completed in October 2024. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis that the development has been constructed, as did the Council.
3. I have removed words not in relation to acts of development from the banner heading above for clarity.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of 73 High Street (No 73), a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA).

Reasons

5. The appeal property was previously a barn constructed in approximately 1773 and was likely to be associated with a property known as The Laurels, they were both possibly part of the larger Manor Farm complex. The building was subsequently divided into three cottages, possibly in the 1930's.
6. The building is linear and gable ended with a dual-pitched roof orientated to parallel with High Street. It is constructed of rubble stone and there have been alterations to the building with 77 High Street (No 77) being rendered white. There are contemporary windows, and 79 High Street (No 79) has rooflights. A chimney stack has been constructed and is located on the centre of the ridge of No 77. Despite these alterations, the appeal building has been identified as a

NDHA for its historic and architectural value. I am aware that a previous permission has been granted for a single storey extension.

7. Paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is clear that the effect of an application on the significance of an NDHA should be taken into account and that a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset.
8. The appeal scheme results in a large addition to No 73 due to its scale and massing, particularly given the width of the gable end compared to the existing gable end of No 77. Moreover, No 73 is located in a prominent position and can be viewed clearly from the super market car park located to the rear of the dwelling. Consequently, it has a higher level of visibility than No 79. Nevertheless, the rooflights added to No 79 are less visible and are not comparable in terms of scale and massing.
9. Additionally, the original building was a T-shaped barn and thus the appeal scheme removes any remaining architectural cues to the previous T-shape. Furthermore, the roof tiles of the appeal scheme are a light grey. Nos 77 and 79 have a relatively earthy-red/brown tile and therefore, the roof tiles of the appeal scheme are, to my mind, a harmful addition and an incongruous feature. This is exacerbated by the dominating scale and massing of the appeal scheme despite the ridge height being subordinate to the original ridge of the dwelling.
10. Given all of the above, the appeal scheme results in the unacceptable erosion of the historic fabric of the NDHA. The proximity of modern development and the existence of relatively contemporary additions to the other cottages in the row, does not justify a development which results in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of No 73. The scale of the harm caused by the appeal scheme upon the NDHA is significant and would not be justified.
11. There has been reference in the evidence before me to the possibility that the re-roofing of the existing dwelling could be undertaken via permitted development rights, contained within the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) and thus could result in a fall-back position. Given the re-tiling of the existing dwelling has taken place, this is a significant material consideration. However, I have identified above that the scale and massing of the development and its erosion of the historical T-shape of the barn results in significant harm to No 73. Consequently, it remains to my mind, that in comparison to the possible fallback position, the appeal scheme results in greater harm to the character and appearance of the NDHA.
12. In conclusion, the appeal scheme conflicts with Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part One and Policies C28 and C30 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 insofar as they seek to ensure developments are of a high design quality and are sympathetic to historic assets including NDHA's.
13. It is for the same reasons that it would not accord with the general principles of the Kidlington Framework Master Plan Supplementary Planning Document 2016.

Other Matters

14. The Grade II Listed 85 High Street is approximately 65m away from the appeal building. The significance of the building derives from its architectural interest and historic fabric. Nevertheless, given the location and extent of the proposed development, I consider that it would preserve the setting of the listed building and the contribution it makes to its significance. A lack of harm in this respect, however, does not alter my overall conclusions.
15. There is limited substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the appeal scheme would significantly enhance No 73's functionality. I therefore attach limited weight to this claimed benefit.
16. Taking all of the above into consideration, there are no material considerations of such weight or significance to justify a decision other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

17. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

B Astley-Serougi

INSPECTOR